

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/773,782	02/02/2001	Raymond Grant Rowe	RD-24,364	8533	
7	590 01/14/2003				
TRACY R. LOUGHLIN			EXAM	EXAMINER	
DOUGHERTY, CLEMENTS & HOFER 1901 ROXBOROUGH ROAD,			WILKINS III, HARRY D		
SUITE 300 CHARLOTTE, NC 28211			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHARLOTTE	, NC 20211		1742		
			DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003	.13	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory A	cti	on
------------	-----	----

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/773,782	ROWE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Harry D Wilkins, III	1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 18-35</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8-17.
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. Other:



Continuation of 2. NOTE: the claim limitation that the zirconium-based alloy is used in nuclear fuel cladding as an annular layer in the cladding was not present in the finally rejected claims. This new limitation would require further search and/or consideration. However, the Examiner would like to emphasize that the cladding taught by Inagaki et al is an "annulus layer".

ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700